DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 083 180 SP 006 973

AUTHOR Rosen, Jacqueline; Palmer, Mary B.
TITLE A Descriptive Analysis of the Cary Leadership Fellows Program: An Experiment in Training for Educational Leadership.
INSTITUTION Bank Street Coll. of Education, New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY Mary Flagler Cary Trust, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE Jul 73
NOTE 51p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Administration; *Educational Change; *Leadership; *Leadership Qualities; *Leadership Training; Minority Group Teachers; Professional Training; Teacher Promotion; Urban Education

ABSTRACT

The program treated in this document assumes that most present educational leaders are perhaps not as effectively trained as possible. Funded by the Mary Flager Cary Trust, the 5-year project is designed to train a selected group of experienced teachers of children--especially minority group teachers from inner-city schools--to become educational leaders and effective agents of change in improving public education. The report consists of four parts: a) outline of the criteria and method used for selecting the fellows and description of the background characteristics of those who were selected: b) description of the program and the rationale of its components; c) the program analysis--its implementation, method and findings; and d) identification of the elements in the program that appeared critical to its success. (JA)

ED 083180

A DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF THE CARY LEADERSHIP FELLOWS PROGRAM: AN EXPERIMENT IN TRAINING FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Jacqueline L. Rosen, Ph.D.
Mary B. Palmer, M.S.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

* * * * *

Director of the Program: Anne Siegel
Associate Director: Anne M. Smith

Program Sponsor: Mary Flagler Cary Trust

* * * * *

July 1973

Bank Street College of Education
610 West 112th Street
New York, N. Y. 10025

SP006973

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction	1
PART 1. SELECTION OF THE FELLOWS	
Criteria and Procedure	4
Characteristics of the Fellows	6
PART 2. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAM	
Overall Goal	8
Basic Program Design	8
Field Work: First Year	10
Student Teaching	10
Community Placement	11
Internships	12
Job Placements: Second Year	13
Concurrent Components of the Program	14
Individual Advisement and Group Conferences	14
Course Work, Seminars and Institutes	16
Work-Study Trips	16
PART 3. THE PROGRAM ANALYSIS	
Background, Overview, and Method	18
Structure and Content of the Interviews	20
Findings and Interpretations	22
Expectations, Initial Concerns, and Goals	23
Problem Solving and Growth in the First Year	25
Problem Solving and Growth in the Second Year	33
Changing Concepts of Leadership and Self-Image	35
The Fellows' Overall Appraisal of the Program	38
PART 4	
Conclusions	43
Appendix: New Careers of the Graduates	47

A DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF THE CARY LEADERSHIP FELLOWS PROGRAM: AN EXPERIMENT IN TRAINING FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Jacqueline L. Rosen, Ph.D.[1]
Mary B. Palmer, M.S.[2]

INTRODUCTION

Training for educational leadership must be drastically revised if public education is to respond constructively to the needs of children and the demands of diverse and concerned communities. It is now widely recognized that the usual hierarchical route to promotion from teacher to supervisor has been inadequate, often involving little more than an accumulation of largely irrelevant academic credits, and resulting in the continuation of the rigidities of the status quo. Many educational leaders who have taken this route in traditional public schools have had little or no exposure to new educational ideas and minimal preparation for working with adults. All too often they have lacked the ability and interest to encourage growth and innovation in the teachers they supervise, or to make positive working relationships with parents and other adults connected with the school.

The need for new forms of leadership in education has been forcefully demonstrated to the Bank Street College of Education in recent years by increasing requests for consultation from elementary school systems, day care centers, Head

---

1. Jacqueline L. Rosen is a Senior Research Psychologist at the Bank Street College of Education and was the program analyst of the Cary Leadership Fellows Program.

2. Mary B. Palmer is a psychiatric social worker at the Lincoln Institute for Psychotherapy and served as associate in the analysis of data on this project.

The authors are indebted to Doris Wallace for her constructive suggestions and editorial help during the preparation of this report.

Start and Follow Through programs in many states, as well as from inner-city schools in New York City itself. Clearly, existing channels have not been able to provide the kind of educational leadership which is in growing demand.

In 1968, in response to this need, the Acting Chairman of the college's Graduate Programs Division proposed an experimental five-year project designed to train a selected group of experienced teachers of children--and especially minority group teachers from inner-city schools--to become educational leaders and effective agents of change in improving public education. In the fall of that year, with funding from the Mary Flagler Cary Trust, the Cary Leadership Fellows Program was launched with a first group of six trainees who were enrolled for a two-year sequence leading to a master's degree in supervision and administration.[3] Each fall thereafter, for the next three years, another group of six fellows entered the program, making a total of four groups, or 24 trainees in all, to graduate by June of 1973.

In the early planning stage, the director of the program enlisted a senior research psychologist from the college's Research Division to serve in the role of program analyst. Together the director and program analyst laid out the basic components of the training, designed a plan for analysis of the program as it moved along (see Part 3), and developed the criteria and methods for selecting the fellows. Thus, program planning, development, and analysis were integrated from the beginning.

The aim of this report is to describe and analyze the impact of the training program. Most of the trainees--designated as fellows--were experienced teachers of children, and the majority of them were black. During the course of

---

3. The Acting Chairman was Anne Siegel, who conceived and directed the project.

the program, they had to embrace an approach to education[4] which, for most of them, was totally different from that which they had employed in their work with children in the classroom, and which was equally different from that which they had experienced as children. Further, they had to confront the difficult tasks of shifting their orientation from that of teaching children to that of working in leadership roles with adults; and toward fostering the approach to education which they themselves were still in the process of incorporating. The success of the trainees' accomplishment of these tasks was striking. Moreover, virtually all who entered this intensive two-year training are now in leadership roles in education, and their services are in great demand.[5]

The remainder of this report consists of four parts, as follows:

Part 1: outline of the criteria and method used for selecting the fellows, and description of the background characteristics of those who were selected;

Part 2: description of the program and the rationale for its components;

Part 3: the program analysis--its implementation, method and findings;

Part 4: identification of the elements in the program which appeared critical to its success.

---

4. For a recent description and analysis of the Bank Street approach to the education of young children, see Shapiro, E. and Biber, B. The education of young children: a developmental-interaction approach. Teachers College Record, September 1972, 74, 1.

5. See Appendix for a list of the positions held by the four groups of trainees who have graduated from the program.

PART 1
SELECTION OF THE FELLOWS

Criteria and Procedure

In seeking candidates who could become effective leaders and change-agents in work with adults--even though their past professional experience had been almost totally with children--the program staff sought to identify among its applicants those with the following qualities or with strong potential to develop them: (1) a basic sense of self-esteem coupled with the ability to be self-critical; (2) an eagerness to learn and the ability to take hold of new ideas; (3) initiative and imagination in approach to work; (4) the ability to communicate ideas and feelings, and to listen to those of other people; (5) acceptance of diversity in people; (6) spontaneity and flexibility; (7) a sense of humor; and (8) respect for individuals, both children and adults, and for their potential for learning and growth. In addition, the candidates chosen would have to have demonstrated success in their work as teachers or in related community work, and be committed to the goals of the program.

To select candidates who manifested these qualities necessitated a rigorous and intensive screening procedure which demanded from the applicants introspection and self-examination in regard to personal and professional goals. As a first step, the applicants were asked to fill out a detailed questionnaire, respond to a projective test,[6] and write an autobiographical essay describing significant stages of their lives as these had bearing on their chosen careers. The questionnaire focused on such areas as why the applicants wished to leave their current work; what gratifications they had derived and what difficulties

---

6. Shapiro, E., Biber, B., and Minuchin, P. The Cartoon Situations Test: a semi-structured technique for assessing aspects of personality pertinent to the teaching process. Journal of Projective Techniques, 1957, 21, 2, 172-184.

they had encountered in any previous experience they might have had as administrators or supervisors; what kinds of gratifications they envisaged in a leadership role; and in what types of settings they hoped to work in the future. A further question asked: "In thinking about people who have been in some kind of supervisory capacity in relation to your work, would you describe one or two persons who were especially helpful to you and try to indicate the process by which the supervisor was thus effective. In the same manner, one or two persons who were not helpful and why." Another asked: "What would you consider to be your own personal and professional strengths as a prospective supervisor or educational leader and in what ways do you feel the need for further development and training?" Still another question asked: "Are there any special ways in which you would like to change personally over the next ten years? Please elaborate."[7]

The program analyst and director (later joined by an associate director)[8] studied the written material in detail, each examining it from her own specialized background as psychologist or educator. Applicants who appeared promising after this stage of the screening process were interviewed at length by the director before a final decision was reached.[9] This assessment procedure, plus

---

7. Some Cary Fellows reported later that they had been almost overwhelmed by these questions. One said she had procrastinated answering for weeks, calling the questionnaire "painful" and admitting she had wished that someone would observe her work and judge her ability for her. Some voiced concern about giving the "right" answers and "looking smart" versus more honest self-criticism. One said she couldn't see why she "had to" review her past. "I had just sort of existed," she said, "and really never looked into myself until I started to write the autobiography." Another said, "It took a great deal out of me. It made me ask myself questions I hadn't raised since I got out of college 15 years ago."

8. Anne Smith, faculty adviser at the Bank Street College of Education.

9. It is important to note that many exceptionally qualified applicants had to be turned down because of the limited places available.

the financial sacrifice entailed for the trainees in going back to school for a full two-year (rather than one-year) master's program, discouraged potential candidates who might have been seeking primarily power and prestige from leadership training.[10]

Characteristics of the Fellows

The first two groups admitted to the program were composed entirely of female teachers with up to 17 years' experience in working with preschool and elementary school children in the public schools. Ten of the 12 fellows making up Groups 3 and 4 were also experienced teachers who had worked with children from preschool to junior high. The remaining two fellows, both males, had had no teaching experience.[11] Both, however, had worked as counselors to adolescents and young adults, and one had been the administrator of a small Head Start program.

All four groups contained many fellows who had served in paid or volunteer positions in some kind of community service, including recreational programs, work with handicapped and retarded children, and on community boards. A number of them had special talents and interests in the creative arts.

Of the total of 24 fellows, 21 were women and three were men. Ages ranged from the mid-twenties to the late forties. Seventeen were married, and of these,

---

10. Included among the fellows were experienced teachers earning as much as sixteen to eighteen thousand dollars a year, and some who already held master's degrees. The stipend of five thousand dollars, therefore, although important, was not a major incentive for entering training.

11. They were brought into the program both because staff members wanted to include men and because they wanted to experiment with ideas for a new project in educational leadership training for people without previous teaching experience. This project, which will differ from the Cary Leadership Fellows Program in concentrating on talented young people without previous training in the field of education, is scheduled to begin in the fall of 1973. It, too, will be directed by Anne Siegel and funded by the Mary Flagler Cary Trust.

15 had children--several with as many as four or five. In conformity with the intention of the program staff to enlist talented members of minority groups, 15 black fellows were enrolled, and were in the majority in three of the four groups.

From material given in their autobiographical essays, or in interviews with the program analyst (see Part 3), it was clear that most of the fellows had in common a considerable struggle to get an education. Few of their parents were college graduates, and some had not finished elementary school, although most appear to have stressed the importance of higher education for their children. (Sometimes a grandparent or other close relative was the major force in encouraging the fellows to achieve in school and go to college.) A number of fellows grew up in extreme poverty. Some had been on welfare during childhood. Others were better off economically, although none was affluent. Among the three groups of fellows whom we studied,[12] there was a common theme of early strivings for mastery and independence, and the presence of important figures in the fellows' lives, including key teachers who had supported these strivings.

---

12. Time did not permit individual study and analysis of the fourth group.

PART 2
DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAM

Overall Goal

The broad goal of the program was to evolve a model for training educational leaders who would play a central role in generating an effective teaching-learning environment for both children and adults in the public schools; for a major premise of the program was that children learn and develop most effectively in an educational setting in which the adults are also in a continuing process of learning and self-development.

The guiding concept of an effective teaching-learning environment grows out of the Bank Street College's philosophy of education. This philosophy has roots in a humanistic tradition and is deeply influenced by advancing knowledge of developmental psychology. It emphasizes responsiveness to individual needs and patterns of growth; the development of self-awareness with the development of knowledge of and relatedness to others; the integration of subjective understanding with objective analysis, and of practice with theory. Thought and feeling are viewed as intimately linked; and intellectual mastery as inseparable from affective experience.[13]

Basic Program Design

The training program was designed as an individualized developmental sequence of integrated theory and practice, gauged to complement and extend the

---

13. This philosophy and its application to the education of children and to the training of teachers is described comprehensively elsewhere. See, for example, Shapiro, E. and Biber, B. The education of young children: a developmental-interaction approach, op. cit.; Biber, B., Gilkeson, E., and Winsor, C. B. Basic approaches to mental health: teacher-education at Bank Street College. Personnel and Guidance Journal, April 1959; Biber, B. A learning-teaching paradigm integrating intellectual and affective processes. In Eli M. Bower and William G. Hollister (Eds.), Behavioral Science Frontiers in Education. New York: Wiley, 1967; Biber, B. Challenges ahead for early childhood education. National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1969.

knowledge and experience of individual fellows at each step. Beginning with work in classrooms with children, where most of them had left off, trainees moved on to work with adults in a series of field placements of increasing responsibility and authority in a variety of differing educational and community settings. Concurrently, in both years, they took courses related to their work and with the required number of credits toward a master's degree or professional diploma, and participated in special institutes, workshops, seminars and work-study trips.

Throughout the two-year sequence, intensive individual and group advisement were designed to provide a continuous system of supports and knowledge-exchange through which the fellows could develop their analytic and interpersonal skills while encountering increasingly complex challenges and responsibilities in their placements.[14] Much of their training was differentiated; the specifics of courses and field placements were worked out by the adviser and fellow together in accordance with each fellow's strengths, interests, and needs. It was expected, as well, that each trainee would be prepared to function in a number of different roles and settings.

The remainder of this section is devoted to a description of the sequential field work placements and concurrent components of the program, along with the rationale for each, as follows:

Field Work: First Year

Student Teaching Placement (minimum of 2 months)
Community Placement (2 months)
Internships in Leadership roles (remainder of year)

---

14. Individual and group advisement have always been an integral part of the graduate training at Bank Street College of Education. See Biber, B. and Winsor, C. B. An analysis of the guidance function in a graduate teacher education program. In Bob Taylor (Ed.), Mental Health and Teacher Education, 46th Yearbook, The Association for Student Teaching (Washington, D.C.), 1967.

Job Placements: Second Year

Leadership positions in selected educational programs
(3/5 time as paid staff for the 10-month academic year)

Concurrent Components: Both Years

Individual Advisement and Group Conferences
Course work, Seminars, and Institutes
Work-Study Trips

Field Work: First Year

Student Teaching

The Student Teaching Placement with which all the fellows began their training was designed, first, to extend and complement each fellow's experience in working with children. Thus, trainees who had worked only in traditional schools were placed in settings such as Bank Street's laboratory school where the educational program is child centered and geared to individual and group developmental needs.[15] Those who had not taught in public schools were given experience in public schools. Other considerations included expanding the fellows' previous experience by placing them with children of different age levels and socioeconomic backgrounds. For the small minority who had never taught children, student teaching placements were extended to two or more.

The second aim of the placement was to give the trainees an opportunity for observing the master teachers' interactions both with children and adults. In what ways, for instance, did the master teacher foster or inhibit the professional growth of paraprofessionals and of student teachers, including themselves? What kind of learning milieu was created for the adults and for the children, and what was its rationale? How was it maintained or altered? An underlying goal here was to provide the fellows with an intensive experience in which they

---

15. See Shapiro, E. and Biber, B., The education of young children: a developmental-interaction approach, op. cit.

were active participants though not responsible for the overall life of the classroom itself. Ideally, they would retain sufficient distance to examine the complexity of that life and the elements that influenced its development so that they could analyze what they observed from the standpoint of prospective agents of educational change.

The third aim was to give the fellows the opportunity to broaden their potential for empathic understanding of students and other adults (with whom they would later work) through their own subjective experiences in this placement.

Community Placement

The second placement was intended to enlarge the trainees' knowledge of community needs, the resources available to meet them, and the limitations of these resources. Working in agencies serving inner-city children and their families, particularly in the fields of medicine and mental health, the trainees could familiarize themselves with the work of professionals from other disciplines and develop collaborative relationships in which they could contribute their knowledge and skills in children's education. In this placement, many worked with both children and adults.

Groups 1 and 2 were attached to a community psychiatry project sponsored by a voluntary hospital in the metropolitan area. The project was designed to forge a closer integration between the hospital, a neighborhood public school, and the community so that the hospital could better meet community needs.

Each fellow was assigned to work with a family in which a child had been diagnosed as sufficiently emotionally disturbed to be placed in a "Junior Guidance Class." As arranged by a field work supervisor and educator on the project, the fellow's task was to help the child's parent(s) accept the placement of the child in this special class, to work with the child individually in the school,

and in some cases to accompany the family on hospital visits or help its members deal with other community agencies. The fellows also participated in staff conferences at the hospital where their cases and those of other families were evaluated and discussed by the psychiatric team. In addition, they had the opportunity to observe family therapy sessions from a one-way vision room.

A different setting was sought for the third group of fellows. This group was placed in a large community health center, affiliated with another hospital, where the fellows were given considerable freedom to carve out their own roles. For example, one fellow completely reorganized the hospital playroom, making it into an area in which young mothers could come to observe the children and, with the help of staff experts, learn about child development *in vivo*.

Members of Group 4 chose to strike out on their own in the time allotted to this placement, and to engage in short-term projects in which their individual skills could be utilized toward some discrete educational goal in different settings throughout the city. (In several cases, agency liaison arrangements were, in fact, initiated by the fellows themselves.) For example, one fellow compiled information and drew up guidelines for an organization serving community school boards to be used in assessing teacher accountability for their pupils' progress. Two others worked with the faculty of a new community college in surveying degree programs in early education in the metropolitan area.

Internships

For all four groups, the internships which completed the first year of field work were arranged by the advisers in consultation with the fellows, according to each trainee's developing interests and training needs. The placements were designed to provide the fellows with opportunities to gain experience in advisory roles with adults--especially teachers and paraprofessionals--as educational consultants, supervisors or administrators. Frequently the fellows functioned

in more than one role and not uncommonly in more than one setting. They were attached to numerous programs such as Follow Through, "Open Corridor" experiments, Early Childhood or Family Day Care centers, often under sponsorship of a college or university. Most worked in the New York metropolitan area but some traveled to other states, including Vermont, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Alabama. Usually they had field work advisers to whom they could turn in addition to their faculty adviser, but occasionally they were virtually on their own in their field work settings.

In addition to their one or more placements during this period, some of the fellows accompanied Bank Street consultants to Head Start and Follow Through programs in several eastern and southern states; and as a result of their work on these trips were themselves asked to serve as consultants during their internships and again in the second year.

Job Placements: Second Year

The second year placements were designed to give the fellows overall responsibility for a major component of an educational program. During this year they worked on a three-fifths time basis as paid professional staff. Although their positions as consultants, staff developers and administrators were sometimes similar to those they had held in their internships, their jobs now involved far greater authority and accountability. The placements also provided time for the fellows to learn, in considerable depth and detail, about the operation and power structure of the school or agency and its surrounding community; to sharpen and refine their skills in relating to adults, and to assess realistically what could be accomplished in effecting change.

The fellows worked chiefly in New York and New Jersey metropolitan areas in programs directed to educational change in inner-city schools. However, as indicated above, some also took on extra part-time assignments as educational

consultants in other parts of the country, e.g., upper New York State, New England, Pennsylvania, and Alabama.

The original plan had been for second-year trainees to become junior faculty in various divisions of Bank Street College, but this was not necessary. As the program became known, more and more paid placements were offered by schools and agencies in the community each year. In fact, there was competition for the services of the fellows, who often had several offers to choose from.

Concurrent Components of the Program

Individual Advisement and Group Conferences

Throughout the two years, the fellows met regularly in individual conferences with their faculty adviser. (The design was for the associate director to serve as adviser to each entering group, the director as adviser to each group in its second year.) The goal was to develop a relationship in which the fellows could experience non-authoritarian, supportive, yet forceful leadership, which emphasized the individual's unique strengths, talents, interests, and mode and pace of learning; encouraged risk-taking and experimentation, and the development of an individual leadership style.

Individual sessions averaged at least an hour a week and often more than that as specific needs arose. These sessions dealt with the fellows' personal-professional concerns and development, the advisers' observations in placement visits, consideration of alternative solutions to problem situations, and plans for the next steps in training.

The fellows and their advisers also met weekly as a group. These group conferences were task-oriented, focusing on field work experiences and broader educational questions, and provided a forum for exchange of ideas and group problem-solving. In addition, an underlying goal was to establish an atmosphere in which the fellows could develop interest in one another's growth, and gain freedom to expose and discuss their own concerns and anxieties regarding their work.

The scope of these conferences was enlarged in the second year to incorporate new dimensions, and the time allotted increased from two hours a week to a full day. This day was devoted to discussions of the group's observations of various educational institutions in the metropolitan area which the members regularly visited together. Furthermore, the fellows themselves rotated as leaders of the discussions. The sessions were videotaped and played back, and the fellows were encouraged to examine themselves as participants in the group process; to analyze how, both as leaders and as individual members, they promoted or thwarted constructive discussion and the goals of the group. It was the responsibility of all to be aware of interaction among themselves and between leader and member: to note how the leader set the tone at the outset of each session, how conflict arose and was handled, who tended to monopolize the time and how this was dealt with, the meaning of body movements and other nonverbal communication, etc. Replay of the videotapes gave the participants an opportunity to look at themselves with some objectivity. While the flow of the group discussion itself was not interrupted, the replay of the film could be stopped at any point by any member of the group, and the practice leader's attention drawn to how he or she permitted a distracting situation to develop or failed to intervene constructively. (The fellows also had access to the tape if they wished to study it again.) Finally, in these conferences, the principles the fellows were encountering in the Group Process Seminar (described below)--which ran concurrently--could be tested out, reinforced, or further developed.

In the contexts of individual advisement and group conferences, the fellows were provided with the opportunity to integrate theory and field work, and to internalize an individualized and democratic approach to the teaching-learning process as intrinsic to the development of a new professional identity.

Course Work, Seminars and Institutes

Courses were taken concurrently with field work throughout the program and, where possible, theory and practice were synchronized. While there was considerable latitude in the selection of courses by individual fellows, the program staff made certain that all trainees would be strong in the technical skills of teaching reading, mathematics, and social studies, and in theories of learning and child development. In addition, where one or more fellows had a great need for courses not available in the regular college curriculum, and which were not of specific interest to the entire group, arrangements were made for special courses with appropriate college faculty.

Each group of fellows also participated in semester- or year-long seminars arranged by the program staff and conducted by members of the college faculty or faculty from other institutions. These included: "Evaluation and Interpretation of Research Studies in Education," "The Use of Multimedia Techniques" (with instruction and practice in using still and movie cameras, tape recorders, and videotape equipment), and "Group Process"--a seminar conducted by an outside consulting psychologist during the second year and designed to complement the regular group conferences held with the advisers through a concentrated focus on theory. Additionally, two to three day institutes and workshops were arranged, using consultants both within and outside the college to cover special topics. These topics ranged from "Children with Learning Problems," "Systems Analysis," "Budget-Making," and "Proposal Writing" to an intensive program in Spanish. Some of the institutes and workshops were arranged for one or two groups only, in response to their special interests.

Work-Study Trips

Work-study trips were arranged during both years to enable the trainees to investigate a wide range of school programs both in this country and abroad.

Some of these trips were made by the total group, others by two or three fellows, and still others by individuals. All the fellows went to England at some point in their training. There--chiefly in London--they studied and worked in "infant" and "junior" schools and some participated in a university teacher-training program. In addition, some fellows elected to go into the urban and rural schools of Puerto Rico. Two fellows chose to study the public health system in Denmark in relation to that country's day care program. Others investigated a variety of innovative programs in public schools, day care facilities, and training centers in this country.

There were also shorter work-study trips to neighboring cities. Groups 3 and 4, for instance, combined forces for a week as participant-observers in an unusual child development center in Philadelphia devoted to providing services for parents (including unmarried mothers) and children from infancy through the middle years.

Finally, as mentioned above, in their second year the fellows made regularly scheduled visits to schools in the metropolitan area.

PART 3
THE PROGRAM ANALYSIS

Background, Overview, and Method

As stated at the outset, the program analyst and the director jointly developed a plan for assessing the program that would yield ongoing information about its operations and their impact on the fellows as a group and as individuals.[16] This was to include periodic assessments of each fellow's personal-professional growth and needs. It was agreed that this assessment would be based primarily on individual interviews held with the fellows at critical junctures in the program, such as following a major field placement. In addition, the program analyst would periodically attend the fellows' group conferences with their advisers, and participate in informal program activities. This close relationship between the program analyst and the program itself was seen as crucial because (1) the complexity of the program could not be adequately comprehended by conventional separation of a researcher from the object of study; (2) the program analyst was to contribute to ongoing planning and program development through weekly meetings with the core staff; and (3) the interviews themselves would require a kind and degree of cooperation from the fellows that could only be attained through the development of trust and confidence in the program analyst.

In the orientation meetings for each new group, both the director and the program analyst stressed the importance of the fellows' contributions to the program analysis as a means of making the program increasingly relevant to their own needs as well as to those of groups of trainees who would follow them. In

---

16. Cf. Rosen, Jacqueline L., Developing Collaborative Relationships for Analyzing and Effecting Educational Change. New York: Bank Street College of Education, 1972 (mimeo).

these meetings the fellows were encouraged to air their concerns about the evaluation and to question the program analyst about the interview procedures. In their first interview with the program analyst, many fellows expressed--either spontaneously or with encouragement--some anxiety about being interviewed by a psychologist, and a few voiced a suspicion that they would be "psyched out."

As far as could be ascertained, however, most of the fellows came to accept the interviews as an integral and valid part of the program because (1) they saw the questions as being pertinent to their concerns, and (2) they saw the needs they expressed being taken into account in subsequent placements, seminars, and other special arrangements that were made by program staff.

As one fellow put it:

> I think having a research study going on <u>during</u> our program makes the process of evaluation more accurate and efficient than if research and evaluation took place after the program was over. The changes called for can be made in time for the new group coming up. Even more exciting is the fact that changes have already been made for our group on the basis of the research interviews.

With growing evidence that the program analysis was in fact contributing to the development of the program, the fellows maintained a high level of cooperation in the program analysis, even though the interviews were often stressful and required them to scrutinize themselves and their work with others in extreme detail.

It was found that this process of intensive self-exploration, guided by a member of a different discipline, produced benefits to the fellows which had not been anticipated when the interview procedure was planned. Many fellows developed new insights either during or after an interview; and many began to synthesize previously unrelated experiences or to analyze an experience in greater depth. For example, one fellow commented:

> Even though much of what I've said has come out in disconnected pieces, I find that after these interviews

> there's a kind of piecing together that I do. It helps me to reflect on some experiences I hadn't thought about for a while, and it makes me probe deeper into something I hadn't thought through before.

Finally, some fellows valued the opportunity of putting their training experiences into perspective, and taking a long-range view of where they had come from and assessing where they wanted to go.

Since a major aim of the program was to promote analytic skills in the fellows, both in relation to themselves and their work, it came about that the interview process operated not only as a tool for evaluating the program but also as a direct means to program goals.

Structure and Content of the Interviews

Four individual interviews were held with each fellow in the first three groups during the first year of training, and two during the second year--one at mid-point and the other at the termination of training. The average interview lasted from two to three hours, with a range from one-and-a-half to five hours. All interviews were taped and transcribed. (The fellows could, however, turn off the tape recorder at any time for an off-the-record remark.) Assurance was given from the outset that in any reports based on the interviews, the fellows' anonymity would be preserved.

A basic set of questions guided each interview, but the aims of the analysis dictated that each fellow's individual needs, perceptions, and modes of learning would be explored in detail. Some interviews contained questions that were specific to that period in time. For example, in the initial interview the fellows were asked about their reasons for entering the program, their expectations of the program, and their concerns upon entering. Some questions were sometimes repeated in subsequent interviews, such as a question examining changing concepts of effective educational leadership or supervision, and another assessing their

own personal-professional growth as leaders. Other questions spanned all interviews. These focused on what the fellows had learned in their recent training experiences, how they had influenced or been influenced by the various segments of their work and training, what conflicts had been generated and how they had dealt with these, which aspects of their recent training had been most valuable and which minimal in value or detrimental to their growth. In addition, their further training requirements were repeatedly explored in conjunction with their developing strengths, needs, and interests. Finally, at the end of their training, the fellows were asked to assess the program as a whole as well as its separate components and to make recommendations for further program changes.

As the program developed, the information obtained from the interviews, combined with information from the advisement and group conferences, from observations of the fellows at work, and from informal reports from the fellows' field work supervisors and employers, was reviewed at the director's weekly meetings with the associate director and program analyst, and provided added feedback concerning both the fellows' individual growth and training needs, and assessment of program components. On the basis of these various sources of information, program staff was able to make appropriate changes, and plan ahead for each succeeding year, from anticipating areas of conflict to building in special seminars at crucial periods in the training. Since most of the basic components remained conceptually valid, alterations were generally at the level of implementation (e.g., changing the locus of a placement). In regard to the fellows' individual training needs, arrangements were made to provide experiences that would build on their interests, or to supply individual advisement on specific difficulties impeding their development (e.g., a tendency to act impulsively; failure to remain task-oriented because of emotional overinvolvement; hesitation to try new approaches to a problem, etc.).

All the sources of information just cited were also used to some extent in the descriptive analysis of the fellows' learning and growth, as reported below (see Findings and Interpretations). We have, however, relied most heavily in this analysis on data from the interviews themselves because these provide the most systematic documentation of the fellows' experiences in the program, its impact on them, their perception of the sources of their learning and growth, and of those elements in the program that were most influential in their changing concepts of their professional selves. Moreover, since the program demanded an intense personal commitment of the fellows to their own growth and change as prospective enablers of other adults, and since such growth and change required increasing self-awareness, with attendant conflict and anxiety, the fellows' reports of their subjective experiences in developing mastery and competence are germane to an analysis of the program's impact.

Findings and Interpretations

For the purposes of this report we have focused on general trends. This means that we have sacrificed material about individual personalities and about how fellows with widely differing talents, needs, and learning styles reacted to and grew in the program. We have also lost some of the color--the humor and ebullience--which characterized individual fellows; and the analysis cannot do justice to the enthusiasm and camaraderie of each succeeding group. Recognizing these losses, we have attempted to point up those trends which might have relevance for other institutions concerned with the development of training programs for leadership in education.

The presentation is organized as follows:

1. A summary, based on the initial interviews, of the fellows' expressed expectations, initial concerns, and goals on entering the program.

2. An analysis of the fellows' reactions to their placements and their

growth and development in field work during the first training year (i.e., in Student Teaching, Community Placement, and Internships); and then in their second year placements as full-fledged staff members of an educational institution.

3. Some observations of changes in the fellows' concepts of effective leadership and in their personal-professional growth during the program.

4. The fellows' overall appraisal of the program and its components.

Expectations, Initial Concerns, and Goals

In their initial interviews, the fellows described their generally high hopes and expectations of the program. They spoke of how they had entered looking forward to the stimulation of new people and new ideas, and to their own development. Most of them specifically said that they welcomed the flexible, individualized nature of their training.

From the very beginning there was a definite aura about the Cary Fellows. They saw themselves as a highly select group (and were generally viewed as such) because they were part of the college's first experiment in training teachers of children to become educational leaders, because of the importance placed on the program by the staff, and particularly because of the intensive selection process they had all gone through. At its most extreme, this feeling was described by one fellow who said, half jokingly:

> I couldn't imagine that I'd been chosen. I just assumed that there must have been millions and millions of people all over the United States who had applied.

Another recalled imagining "hundreds" of rival applicants, and wondered:

> How did they choose me? What special thing did I have that other people didn't have or didn't show at that particular time? For weeks after being accepted, I found myself thinking maybe they have the wrong files, and they'll call back and say they made a mistake. It's fantastic! You have to be the best to get things like this.

This sense of being specially chosen was not without its anxieties, however,

since the fellows felt themselves under pressure to live up to an exceedingly high standard of performance.

There was also some apprehension among the fellows about how they would get along with one another, working in a small group in such close association for the next two years. For those who had had little working experience with adults, and who had spent most of their days in the company of children, there were questions about being accepted by their professional peers. Others wondered whether they would be getting into a form of group therapy--and, if so, whether this would be a positive or negative experience. One fellow, fearing the latter, stated in her first interview that she expected "challenge" and "competition" to develop in her group.

Other concerns on entering the program ranged from doubts about academic ability (especially for those who had been out of school for many years) to fear of neglecting responsibilities at home.

Although specific motivations for entering the program varied, a recurring theme throughout the first interviews revealed a discontent with the schools and a feeling of impotence (in the positions the fellows had held) to effect needed changes; and an increasing conviction that they had the potential, with further training, to make a much wider impact on the education of children. The following statements are representative, as expressed by two experienced teachers:

> When I was first teaching in public school, I was really crying for help some place. But there was never anyone around. Later on I'd see young teachers come into the school--pretty nice people--but after a very little time they just couldn't cope with the kids. They'd become educated by the old teachers there and would become like them--screaming disciplinarians who really began to believe that kids couldn't learn and couldn't think. I came to feel that these teachers were really victims too, like the children. So I felt for a long time that the schools needed some kind of on-the-job teacher training. And that's what I'm interested in.

* * * * * * * * * *

> I started seeing things change in the school system and young teachers come in and flounder, and the children were the butt of the floundering....So I began to think, if I can reach 25 or 50 children through the year, think how many children I could reach if I could get to two or three or five teachers! It would be multiplied by 50!

While most of the fellows described long-range goals of creating more effective learning experiences for children and teachers, few were committed at the outset to specific leadership roles. Most welcomed the fact that their advisers encouraged them to keep their options open. They were challenged by the idea of finding their own directions and discovering new talents, abilities, and interests as they moved through the program. As one fellow put it:

> One of the things I really loved about the idea of the program was that you didn't have to be locked into position. It was open-ended.

Problem Solving and Growth in the First Year

The Student Teaching Placement posed a challenge for many fellows in confronting a new approach to the education of children, and for some in developing the objectivity necessary to move ahead in preparation for their leadership roles with adults.

Some fellows readily embraced the more "open" and individualized teaching approach as a means of reaching the many "lost" children they had encountered in traditional classrooms where activities are structured for the class as a whole, and such fellows tended to orient themselves to the task at hand. Others experienced considerable conflict over the new approach, and expressed feelings of competition with and/or anger toward the master teachers in whose classrooms they were assigned to work. These reactions were found most often--though not exclusively--among those fellows who were highly experienced elementary school teachers with a traditional teacher-centered orientation, and who had been placed in "open classrooms." Moving into roles as student teachers with master teachers

who may have had less teaching experience than they had had, and with other student teachers who were at a preservice level, they had to contend with feelings of being identified as subordinates. Further, they had to deal with their own disapproval of what they initially saw as lack of planning and direction in the classroom, and of a master teacher who allowed children not only to design and work on their own projects, but whose expectations for the children were not attached to standard yardsticks of achievement. Moreover, the master teacher's approach tended to pose a special threat to the professional identity of those fellows whose teaching style had been intimately bound up with issues of control. The fellows who had to overcome these kinds of obstacles tended to take longer than others in mastering the new concepts and methods; but they did so in time.[17] This first placement, in which they were finally able to see the results of what at first had made little sense to them, served as the entering wedge in changing their values and beliefs about how children learn most effectively. One of these

---

17. Once the potential sources of difficulty were recognized from the experiences of Group 1, the staff was better able to prepare subsequent groups for the Student Teaching Placement. The major effort was to place greater and continuing stress on the broad goals of the placement--that beyond immersing themselves in a new teaching style or environment the fellows were expected to observe objectively and analytically all aspects of classroom life, including especially the master teacher's approach to parents, teacher aides, other student teachers, and themselves, thus anticipating their own future roles as prospective change agents with teachers and other adults connected with the schools. This goal-directed, task-oriented emphasis with the fellows helped those who were initially sensitive to (or sometimes infuriated by) treatment in which their status was as a subordinate and their basic competence was ignored. In some instances, such fellows came to recognize that they themselves might pose a threat to master teachers who were unaccustomed to having experienced teachers in an apprentice role observing them; and were then able to move from a defensive posture to a more supportive role in relation to the master teacher. A few fellows who complained of an autocratic attitude in their master teachers toward adults, including themselves, were able, eventually, to step back and observe the negative aspects of this approach on the classroom as a whole, and thus to heighten their awareness of the importance of the teacher's relations with adults as well as with children in creating an effective learning environment.

fellows, for example, described her experience in retrospect as follows:

> I've always loved children and enjoyed making learning as pleasurable as possible. But in my own classroom I was still very much the controller. I thought I had to be. I even had dreams about loss of control, in which I'd be standing there, completely helpless, while the kids took over. That's where I was at. Something inside me was saying this was wrong, but I couldn't let go because the kids might go crazy!...It wasn't until after I'd been through the student teaching placement that I could begin to relax and trust children more. I think I've made a tremendous shift for a traditional teacher, and someone who went through a strict school myself. I'd never been in a classroom before where children were allowed to experiment and try new things--instead of being given tests and marks that scare the hell out of you. If I'd been taught this way myself, I'd have realized my potential years ago. This sort of experience should be available to everyone.

In general, those fellows who had the least amount of teaching experience, and those whose experience had been primarily with very young children, moved through the Student Teaching Placement with considerably less conflict (even though the former required two or more placements to develop basic skills with children). The fellows with little or no teaching background simply did not have the same basis for feeling competitive with or threatened by the master teacher: they had less to unlearn and no investment in a set teacher identity which the more experienced teachers had built up over the years.

Trainees who had worked as preschool and kindergarten teachers and were now placed in elementary classrooms tended to see their major learning task as the mastering of specific curricula which were totally new to them. Most of them could turn to the master teacher for help in this area without a sense of competition. And although they were sometimes anxious about their ability to relate to older children, they generally found the "open classroom" relatively compatible with their previous teaching milieu and style--accustomed as they were to the physical mobility and freedom of the young children they had worked

with, and the flexibility demanded of the teacher in responding to individual children at the pre-primary levels.

Despite the problems encountered by some fellows in this placement, the trainees, with only one exception,[18] came to view the Student Teaching experience as a vital part of the program. Most of them found the experience valuable as they lived through it. Others became aware of its value only later as they began to apply what they had learned in subsequent placements.

The Community Placement for Groups 1 and 2 exemplified a situation in which difficulties of implementation, arising largely from conditions within the field setting itself, could not be overcome. Here such difficulties resulted in a diffusion of the fellows' role as liaison between the hospital, community and school; and the integration of the fellows' activities did not take place as fully as had been visualized. Although the fellows in both groups often felt frustrated during this placement, most of them later gave evidence of having profited from it and viewed a community placement as an important component of leadership training. For example, some fellows came to see the dilemma of a psychiatric team attempting to deal with emotional problems in families whose basic material needs are not also being met. For those trainees who had had no previous exposure to the problems of economically deprived communities, the frustrating experience of trying to help people procure medical care and other services had a solid and undoubtedly lasting impact. The most significant value of the placement for most fellows in the first two groups was the understanding they gained of the importance of school-community relations, and of the possibilities that exist for the schools to help meet the needs of children and their families, a first step being an intimate knowledge of those needs and of the

---

18. A fellow who had worked in open classrooms before, and whose experience was in fact greater in this respect than that of the master teacher.

nature of the community resources available.

Members of Group 3 who were assigned to a community health center attached to another hospital in the metropolitan area described generally positive experiences as they moved through this placement, despite the fact that financial and political factors affected the implementation of the hospital program as a whole. The fellows in this group were allowed more freedom to choose and define their own roles and to design projects of relatively limited scope so that they had a clear-cut sense of accomplishment. The degree to which this placement had an impact on individual fellows varied with their ingenuity in planning their own projects and the cooperation they were able to obtain in carrying them out. For example, the fellow who was able to turn the seldom-used hospital playroom into a small child development center encountered and overcame resistance on the part of hospital staff at several levels. Success in this project was celebrated by a party at the hospital, and her highly visible accomplishment gave her a true beginning sense of her ability to effect change in collaboration with other adults.

We learned from their interviews, however, that for most fellows at this time, no matter where they were placed, their own group conferences took precedence over their field work settings as the major forum for learning to work cooperatively with--and feel accepted by--other professional adults.

The Internships marked the critical turning point in the training program as the fellows moved for the first time into leadership roles with adults. Faced with the immediate, practical necessity to explain and interpret educational methods and goals to teachers, paraprofessionals, parents and other people in the community, they expressed two major concerns: (1) whether they had sufficient knowledge and skills to convey to these adults, and (2) whether they could relate to adults in ways that would promote the latters' learning and growth.

Both these concerns provided incentive for renewed study and an avid search for answers. Regarding the first question--whether they had something to contribute--trainees who said they had previously relied almost entirely on their "good feeling for children" now wanted to analyze their skills and to fill in gaps in their knowledge of child development theory and curriculum. There was a striking increase in reading at this time, some fellows reporting that they had read more in this semester, and with greater intensity and comprehension, than they had during the course of several years past; and sometimes to a greater extent than they had as undergraduates when study had often seemed abstract and unrelated to their daily lives.

The second question--regarding their ability to motivate adults to growth and change--became an absorbing concern and the major focus of the group conferences. By this time, the fellows in each group had developed a strong sense of mutual support and trust which enabled them to air freely anxieties and self-doubts as they moved into their individual placements (and in some instances their feelings of rage and impotence when confronted with a wall of resistance on the part of school administrators and teachers). It was during this time that members of the group, now beginning to have many varied experiences, became increasingly competent in helping one another see alternative approaches to the problems they faced. Thus, they both offered support and yet conveyed the expectation that a fellow faced with external resistance could nevertheless make progress by trying out various modes of intervention. When a trainee returned to the group conference with a report of success after much struggle, other members of the group shared in that success and simultaneously found in the experience the promise that they, too, could move on to greater mastery.

During this placement, most fellows confronted and effectively met some challenge of leadership, large or small. And with that first success came an

almost palpable shift in the fellows' self-confidence and sense of competence. For them, it meant that finally they had proof that they had something to offer adults as well as children, and that what they had to offer was useful and legitimate. For those individuals who had never before been in a formal superordinate position in relation to adults, the experience of mastery in a first leadership role and subsequent change in their personal-professional self-concept, paralleled (in telescoped dimensions) the dynamics of movement from one developmental stage to another.

There was a small minority of fellows who were unable to move forward in this fashion during their internships because they were not yet psychologically or professionally prepared to forge ahead at this time, or because the resistance they met on the part of school personnel was in reality too strong for them to make inroads toward change during the allotted period. For such fellows, the first critical experience of mastery in a leadership role was not to come until the following year.

However, as stated earlier, the vast majority of the fellows broke this barrier in their development during the internships in the final part of their first training year. One fellow, for example, described her sense of "coming into my own" in her dual internships as interim assistant principal in an independent school, and as educational consultant to a community board engaged in setting up a new day care center in Harlem. Among her responsibilities as assistant principal, she interviewed a number of parents and their children who were applying for admission to the school in the fall. In working with the community board, she described mastering another aspect of leadership: that of enabler and resource person who draws out others' ideas before responding directly to requests for help. These experiences fostered a new level of confidence and professional self-concept so that when her field adviser asked her to run a three-

day workshop for educational aides, she found herself responding:

> ...as though we were both consultants--as though we were equals. What I asked her was where the aides were "at" in their training--not what to teach them or how to teach. It was a different kind of asking. I know now that it was in that room and on that day that I jumped from student to leader!

Many fellows found their work with educational aides and other non-professionals particularly challenging and exciting. One, for instance, had to face the problem of how to conduct a class in child development for a group of day care aides whose education ran the gamut from eighth grade to Ph.D. Another fellow who worked successfully with members of a lay community board described her experience as follows:

> When they learn, you learn. They come to you with a kind of freshness....You get so accustomed to thinking about what the expected answer is going to be when you're working with teachers and children. But when you're working with these people who have never been trained in your course of study, you never know what their responses are going to be. Almost always they are the answers you least expect. It's really interesting because they take you into avenues of discussion that you hadn't planned; from their experiences in the home, or a church, or a Sunday school, or a barber school--or wherever they've been working. So you have to cue into them, and pick up from there.

On examining the accounts of such experiences in the interview data, we found that the fellows had begun to use the same principles in their approach to the adults with whom they were working that they attributed--in the following year--to their advisers' work with them. They spoke, for example, of the importance of listening closely to other people in order to understand their needs and interests; of recognizing and building on the individual's strengths and talents; of encouraging initiative, experimentation, and responsibility; and of accepting the individual's own rate of growth. At this point in their training, however, few of the fellows were aware of these parallels.

Problem Solving and Growth in the Second Year

In their second year Job Placements, the fellows faced the challenge of taking total responsibility for some aspect of an educational program as salaried professionals in schools, colleges, or community agencies. Although for many fellows the internships had set the stage for this second year, the earlier assignments had not involved the degree of accountability now demanded of them. They were now full-fledged staff members, committed to a real job and responsible to their employers.

While this new level of responsibility was generally viewed by the fellows as official recognition of their growing ability, it also placed them under added pressure to prove themselves capable as leaders and change-agents--sometimes in the face of considerable opposition. For example, in schools in which the fellows were hired to help introduce a more "open" educational approach, there was often resistance on the part of classroom teachers; and this difficulty was compounded in those occasional situations where the school administration, while professing to support the new approach, was in fact either uncooperative or actually hostile. In such cases, the fellows had to learn to understand the power structure and personalities involved, and had to judge realistically how much they could accomplish. They had to assess when to lower or postpone their initial goals, and when to stand firm on an issue--either in the classroom or at the administrative level. One fellow summarized her experience in such a setting:

> This year has been the roughest, hardest battle I've ever been in! But it was incredibly valuable. Now I feel I can take on practically anything.

The majority of the fellows, however, reported more rewarding and less frustrating experiences in their assignments in Follow Through, Open Corridor, and Day Care programs, and in their work as junior faculty in various colleges

where they taught courses and supervised graduate and undergraduate students. For many, the rewards of the second year were also tangible:

For example, two of the fellows who worked in university-sponsored Open Corridor programs as teacher-advisers combined forces to write an explanatory manual for parents, which was subsequently published and widely distributed. Another fellow's skill as an adviser and demonstration teacher was recognized when she was selected as the subject of an educational film. Still another addressed a county chapter of the National Association for the Education of Young Children and conducted a seminar on the Open Corridor approach with a large group of educators which was so well received that she was asked to give additional seminars to graduate students in a city college.

Among those fellows who worked in the day care field, one was chosen as the educational consultant on an interdisciplinary committee (which included representatives from the legal, social work, and architectural professions) charged with assisting parents and community groups in the five boroughs of New York City in their efforts to organize day care centers. Another fellow, who had been a major force in the conception and organization of a day care center during the preceding spring and summer, took over the job of training day care workers for a large area of Brooklyn and, in a second job, organized a program for bilingual teachers to become teacher-trainers.

Some fellows served as consultants to Follow Through in school systems in several states, and others held junior faculty appointments at Bank Street College and other colleges where they taught a wide variety of courses at the graduate and undergraduate level, supervised student teachers, and held administrative posts.

With only occasional setbacks or plateaus, most fellows forged ahead in their job placements with adults during this second year and faced each new task

--a consultation, a speech, a workshop--with increasing confidence and success.

For a few trainees, it was during this final year that the Bank Street philosophy and approach to the education of children was mastered; and only then did confidence and competence in work with adults become possible. This delayed integration in learning occurred for some fellows whose previous teaching experience had been quite limited, and for some former elementary school teachers whose own professional experience as well as childhood education had been in exceptionally traditional schools. One of these reported a breakthrough when she saw the results of her demonstration teaching reflected in the changed style of work in a traditional teacher she was advising and in the teacher's greater effectiveness with her class. This experience provided concrete validation of the teaching method itself, and convinced the fellow both that it could be conveyed to others and that she herself was competent to promote adult learning.

Just before their graduation, the fellows universally stated that they felt well prepared for positions as educational leaders. Most expressed a sense of great confidence while stressing, at the same time, the expectation that they would continue to expand their horizons. As one fellow put it:

> I really feel like I'm on top of everything; that there's nothing in the field of education that I wouldn't be able to tackle. I'm not saying I'd succeed--but I'd be willing to try. You're never "there," but you can feel good about yourself, and keep on growing, knowing there'll always be new things to learn.

Changing Concepts of Leadership and Self-Image

The fellows' professional and personal growth was further illustrated by their answers to questions repeated in the sequential interviews concerning: (1) their concept of the "ideal" leader, and (2) their personal-professional image of themselves.

Concepts of Leadership. At the beginning of their training the fellows tended to give quite narrow definitions of the "ideal" educational leader or

supervisor, enumerating qualities which appeared to reflect their own previous experience with supervisors and their identification with the supervisee. Most often they underscored the nurturant and protective aspects of supervision, using such words as warm, encouraging, praising, helpful, giving, fair, and loyal. By the end of their training, these same fellows defined the supportive aspect of the supervisor's role in terms more suited to equals, using such words as mutually respectful, trusting and deserving of trust, cooperative, non-judgmental, flexible, and responsive to the ideas of others. They also spoke of the need for clarity in setting goals with their supervisees, and for finding and promoting their individual strengths. While still recognizing the importance of the supportive role, these fellows, in their final interviews, put greater emphasis on the necessity for the leader to be confident, self-aware, mature, and knowledgeable about human behavior; to be observant and analytic; to have "vision" and creative ideas in planning for the future; to have political awareness and skill; and to be able to delegate authority, yet also be able to make decisions and take forceful action when necessary. Finally, there was a notable shift of interest from the supervisor-teacher relationship per se, to a wider concern for and empathy with other adults, including parents, in both the school and the community.

Personal-Professional Self-Image. At the end of their training, all the fellows stressed that they had gained in inner strength, maturity, and self-esteem. These subjective reports were strikingly evident in their behavior in the interviews, as well as in their descriptions of their work. (It is also important to note that these are qualities which the fellows themselves now considered necessary for effective leadership.)

For some of the fellows, there were fairly dramatic changes in personality, attitudes, and behavior. Two fellows who had had strong perfectionistic tenden-

cies upon entering the program, and who had always set unrealistically high standards for themselves and others, became strikingly more free and relaxed, giving up what they saw as their rigid and authoritarian style. For both these fellows, participation in a democratic and supportive group, accompanied by a great deal of banter and conviviality, was undoubtedly a major force in the change that took place. One of these fellows, exposed to the unfamiliar milieu of an open classroom, experienced a "rude awakening," being confronted in no uncertain terms with how rigidly she clung to her own ideas and how prone she was to impose them on others. To step back and observe how both children and adults could learn and respond in very differing ways and under varying conditions became the spur for an intensive self-examination, with a great deal of attendant anxiety, and eventually led to a real shift in her expectations of herself and others. In the second year she described to the program analyst how her "style had become so much more relaxed and flowing"; and in the final interview she laughed as she said, "The fact that I'm not perfect just doesn't bother me anymore."

Two other fellows exemplify a quite different change. When they entered the program as experienced teachers of children, they were deeply concerned about whether they could work effectively with adults, with whom they felt shy and diffident. Both felt unable to assert themselves with adults, saying that they feared if they disagreed or argued, it would ruin the relationship, and so they had kept silent even at the cost of becoming depressed at times. Both these fellows had repeated opportunity to test out and overcome their fears in the free atmosphere of the group conferences and with other adults in the field; and when one took strong issue with a field work supervisor for whom she had great admiration, it was a revelation for her to discover that the supervisor's respect for

her only increased.[19]

Another fellow who had spent years working with very young children entered the program saying that she had done so with some trepidation because it was really the first time in her life that she was moving out to do something for herself. Previously she had been totally wrapped up in meeting the needs of other people, and found herself drained at the end of every day from her deep "overinvolvement." During the course of the program, she came to accept her own needs as valid and to recognize that she could be even more useful than she had been in the past by finding work that was interesting and satisfying to her, and developing greater objectivity about the people with whom she worked. Although, as noted earlier, all the fellows gained in self-esteem during their training, in this fellow who was able to change a life-long pattern in which she had largely ignored her own needs, the change in self-image was especially notable.

The Fellows' Overall Appraisal of the Program

In answer to questions at the end of both years as to what they had found most valuable in the program, the fellows stressed first the individualized nature of their training and then gave priority to the following: (1) field work, (2) individual advisement, and (3) group conferences.

In regard to individualization of the training, the following comment by one of the fellows is representative:

> It's so good because it's tailor-made. It's the only time throughout my schooling that my needs and interests and my growth were the main concern of the people planning the program. I've been consulted at every step. I haven't felt that the program was the primary concern, but that I was. It's just unique.

(1) Actual practice in the field was universally described by the fellows

---

19. In fact, she was later to become the supervisor's chief associate in a large-scale project.

as an indispensable source of learning: the only way to test and refine theory, to experiment and explore new ideas, and to get confirmation that they had developed the technical and interpersonal skills necessary for educational leadership. The first year exposure to many different settings was valued for opening new vistas and allowing the fellows to visualize themselves in many new roles. In the second year, as one fellow summarized, "The most vital thing for me was being handed over a program and being told to make it work." She went on to say, along with other fellows, that this taking of responsibility had led to a sense of autonomy and development of an individual leadership style.

(2) Although the fellows varied in the extent of their dependency on their faculty advisers, all stressed the importance to them of their advisers' continuing support, encouragement, and availability. All viewed their individual conferences as valuable in providing continuous opportunity to assess themselves in relation to their work and career goals, and for planning next steps in their training. Individual fellows emphasized the particular elements that had been most important to them, e.g., learning to consider and weigh alternative solutions, valuing experimentation as a part of learning regardless of outcome, or mastering the art of patient listening that their advisers had demonstrated to them.[20]

(3) The group experience was generally ranked as equally important as field work and individual advisement. For example, one fellow described it at the end of her first year:

> One part of my being able to go out and do things I couldn't do before, or thought I couldn't do, has to do with my adviser, and the other part has to do with the group saying to

---

20. Certain field supervisors were also regarded as important models or contributors in other ways to the learning process, as were some of the college faculty and second year or graduate Cary Fellows.

> me, "You're ready." I have real respect for everybody in the group as sincere and really working hard--involved in changing and open to learning. Rarely have I seen this kind of motivation before.

Other fellows in their first year made similar appraisals of their group conferences, stressing the freedom they felt to reveal mistakes and ask for help. As one put it, "You don't have to impress anyone." Another said, "The group is a real sounding board for testing out ideas and learning together." For those who were working alone in the field and without much field supervision, the group became what one of them described as "an antidote to alienation."

In the second year group conferences, the fellows emphasized how much they had learned by rotating as leaders and "critiquing" themselves and one another. Most found the videotaping to be extremely helpful. One called it "the best learning experience I can think of," and went on to say:

> During my years as a classroom teacher, I never imagined myself in any kind of leadership role. Only when I started practice leading did I really begin to change--especially when I saw myself on videotape. I learned about my capabilities through seeing myself and through seeing the reactions of other people. It was then that I realized that there was something within me that I had kept very neatly packaged away and was kind of afraid to explore. And then, through working and working with this same group of people, I started unwrapping the box and giving it more exposure.

In assessing other components of their training as they looked back over the two years, the fellows emphasized that they had derived the greatest benefit from those courses, seminars, and institutes that were directly related to or useful in their current work. For each group as a whole, for instance, theory discussed in the Group Process Seminar was viewed as directly applicable both to field work and to the group conferences. Similarly, skills acquired in the multi-media workshop were put to immediate use by a number of the fellows, especially in presenting illustrative material in their workshops with teachers and paraprofessionals (and in fact served to shape the career focus for one

fellow who was to become a specialist in making educational films in connection with her role as a teacher-trainer).

In general, then, when the academic elements were timed to relate to practical need, the benefits were reinforced because the theory then provided guidelines for work in the field, and the work, in turn, gave substance to the theory.

This is not to say, however, that the seminars, institutes, and workshops which were not directly applicable to ongoing work were not also valuable. For these were almost invariably arranged to meet some broader or long-range need of these prospective leaders, which they themselves recognized. Thus, for those who envisioned themselves in administrative roles, there was intense interest in the seminars on school systems' budget-making and proposal writing. And for virtually all the fellows, the institute which focused on helping teachers develop diagnostic acumen with children with differing learning disabilities, and on how teachers can use diagnostic skills to individualize work with children, was seen as exceptionally pertinent to their broader concerns.

The research seminar, which was designed to enable the fellows to evaluate research reports in education, was at first approached by them with trepidation. As anticipated, the majority had never broached the research literature because the language, charts and tables had seemed unintelligible. Like many teachers, the fellows had assumed that it was irrelevant or had felt threatened by it. As a result of the research seminar, most of the fellows found that a whole new literature had been opened to them (and here it is important that the research reports which formed the basis of this work dealt with topics in which the fellows were intensely interested, e.g., the issue of race and the heritability of intelligence). For a number of them, another program goal was here realized --to sharpen their analytic skills and help them think about problems more objectively. (A few fellows also made practical use of the seminar to help them

organize educational surveys and to develop an instrument for assessing creativity in children in open classrooms.)

The major problem which the academic side of the program presented was that there was not enough time for the extra reading and study which the fellows wished to do. The heavy responsibility assumed by them in their job placements during the second year, which they considered essential to their professional development, tended to limit opportunity for study, however. Further, since the regular courses offered by the college are largely for the preparation of beginning teachers with liberal arts degrees, the more experienced fellows expressed a need for more course work at an advanced level.[21]

Finally, the work-study trips in this country and abroad gave the fellows first-hand knowledge of many educational innovations and stimulated their interest in applying elements of these programs to their own work.[22] An additional important benefit to the fellows was the enhancement of their sense of professionalism; of belonging to a larger group of educators who were searching for new solutions to common educational problems.

---

21. It is of interest to note that three fellows have gone on to doctoral programs, while a fourth spent six months at the Froebel Institute in London on a Ford Foundation fellowship.

22. The exposure of the fellows to the British system took on particular significance when, about a year after the Cary Program began, the New York State Commissioner of Education urged adaptation of the British primary school model in public schools throughout the state. Thus they were uniquely prepared to train teachers and other school personnel in an educational philosophy and method consistent with that which was expected to become the state-wide model.

PART 4
CONCLUSIONS

This report has described an experimental program designed as a model for training prospective educational leaders to develop their own leadership styles and become effective change-agents in improving public education. In our view, several factors support the contention that the Cary Leadership Fellows Program was a success.

The sequential interview data obtained during the two years of training provide detailed documentary evidence of the fellows' struggles toward growth and change, their mastery of basic theory, specific competencies, their increasing self-confidence and autonomy in their work, and their enthusiasm about the program. External validation of the program's success is provided by the fact that all graduates were offered important positions as educational leaders--often more than one, and often in the same organizations in which they had worked in their second year of training. The responsible positions they hold as supervisors, teacher-trainers, consultants or administrators are all in some way related to the improvement of public education, and most involve work with minority groups. Furthermore, unsolicited, positive feedback has been received from their employers, their professional colleagues, and representatives of community organizations with whom they have had contact as lecturers and leaders of institutes, workshops and seminars. Feedback from the graduates themselves (in written communications and in visits to the college) provides further evidence of continuing impact: they exude a sense of competence, authority and direction that contrasts sharply with their doubts and anxieties upon entering the program.

What accounts for these achievements? How did the fellows become effective leaders? How, in particular, did the majority of the fellows whose past experience had centered almost exclusively on teaching young children, integrate a

new approach to education and learn to work effectively with adults?

In attempting to answer these questions, we present the following interlocking elements, described in this report, which appear to us to be crucial to the success of the program.

1. An intensive assessment of applicants which explores their strengths, motivations, and goals is essential in selecting people with strong leadership potential and commitment to constructive change in the schools. As a side effect of the selection process, trainees view themselves as members of a group for which high expectations exist. While this arouses anxiety, it also acts as an impetus to learning and achievement.

2. Individualization of training with emphasis on the trainees' accountability as responsible partners of the staff in planning and evaluating their work in the program and the program itself, fosters critical ability, self-awareness, and autonomy. Moreover, trainees get confirmation that they are taken seriously and can make an impact when their ideas for changes in or additions to the program are accepted and acted on by the staff.

3. Faculty advisers who demonstrate non-authoritarian, supportive, yet forceful leadership create an environment in which trainees, both as individuals and as a group, experience the process and effects of relationships with other adults that serve as a paradigm for their own future leadership roles. Emphasizing the talents and strengths of each individual, while accepting mistakes as an inevitable part of learning, these advisers act as catalysts in problem-solving, encourage risk-taking and experimentation, and support evolution of individual leadership styles.

4. Group solidarity and the forging of strong bonds among adult peers provides for free exchange of ideas, information and concerns among the trainees and fosters an impetus to achieve. The group is both supportive and demanding.

It offers help and advice, but also exerts pressure to overcome obstacles and move ahead. As individual group members master difficult situations, they implicitly challenge other group members to follow suit. Further, in revealing to the group their own initial uncertainties and anxieties, these individuals also convey the promise that the others can also achieve mastery.

5. Actual experience in the field in a carefully planned sequence of placements over a two-year period promotes a gradual transition from effectiveness in work with children and expertise in curriculum to competence in leadership roles with adults. This sequence is paced to the individual, each placement containing elements with which the trainee is familiar, while at the same time demanding new levels of knowledge and skill as the trainee takes on positions of increasing responsibility and authority.

6. Academic courses, seminars, institutes, etc., are appropriately timed, whenever possible, to introduce theory and subject matter that are most directly relevant to the problems--both human and educational--that the trainees are attempting to solve in their field work at each successive stage. Such timing capitalizes on the trainees' motivation to obtain the further knowledge and theory they need for effective field work as they move through the program, and thus facilitates the integration of theory, knowledge, and practice.

7. Encouraging the trainees to re-examine their previous professional practices and consciously compare them with the new educational approaches they are learning reinforces that learning by conjuring up vivid examples that pinpoint the differences and call attention to the underlying rationale and effectiveness of each method.

8. Observation and study of a wide range of educational systems and practices, and of community problems and resources, provide the trainees with a broad base for understanding current issues confronting educational leaders, and promote

their identification with an extended group of professionals in the common cause of dealing constructively with educational problems.

9. Ongoing evaluation by a program analyst who is integrated into the program from the very beginning becomes an important instrument in planning and development at every stage, and brings another perspective to the program and its impact. Moreover, when repeated in-depth interviews with the trainees are intrinsic to the evaluation procedure, their self-awareness and analytic abilities are enhanced--a major program goal.

* * * * * * * * * * * *

As the experimental phase of the Cary Leadership Fellows Program comes to an end, the program is being instituted as a permanent component of the Bank Street Graduate Programs Division, with minor modifications related to the financial resources of a small independent college.

It is our hope that other colleges and universities concerned with training for effective educational leadership will find this report of interest and value.

APPENDIX

New Careers of the Graduates

Members of Group 1 (graduated in 1970): Five are in leadership positions, while one continues classroom teaching for personal family reasons.

Acting Project Director of a Follow Through program in a city public school where 99% of the children and 10% of the teachers are black. Works with parents, staff developers, mental health personnel, and seven teaching teams.

Faculty member in the Education Department of a community college serving chiefly black students. Teaches courses in early childhood education curriculum and child development. Also teaches course in "Basic Language Development: Exploration of Non-Standard English and Black Dialect" in a graduate college of education. Working on doctorate.

Educational Director in a government-sponsored Child Care Center. Developing curriculum, training staff, liaison with teachers and parents. Also teaches course in "Introduction to Early Childhood Education" to undergraduates in a city college.

Faculty member of a branch of a state university. Teaches two undergraduate courses in education. Charged with designing and organizing a new department of early childhood and elementary education which will include the use of audio-visual techniques.

Faculty member in a graduate college of education, as adviser in an intern program consisting chiefly of black and Puerto Rican students. Also teaches child development courses. Is working on doctorate.

Members of Group 2 (1971):

Faculty member of a city college. Administrator in a citywide, state-funded program to promote open education in the public schools of a large metropolitan area, with responsibility for organizing workshops and other learning opportunities for teachers throughout the city. Also teaches course in "Innovations in Education." Immediately after graduation, spent six months studying at the Froebel Institute in London on a Ford Foundation fellowship.

Principal of a large city public school under community control with a student population 60% Spanish-speaking and 40% black. Also member of the board of trustees for a correctional-educational school for boys with special adjustment problems.

Adviser of teachers and supervisory personnel in an Open Corridor program in a large city public school system.

Faculty member of a two-year urban community college, with an open admissions policy, as adviser to students from minority groups who are placed in public schools and day care programs associated with the college. Also teaches course in early childhood education.

Associate Professor in a branch of a midwestern state college which is experimenting with faculty-student management and a multi-disciplinary approach. Planning a cooperative intervention program between the college and the public schools in a large midwestern city to retrain experienced teachers in open education. She will become the director of the program. Working on doctorate degree.

Associate Director of teacher training in an urban alternate school. State consultant on open education for two city public school systems.

Members of Group 3 (1972):

Senior Field Representative for one of the largest Follow Through projects in the country, located in the South. Responsible for training staff developers, teachers, ancillary personnel and work with parent groups. Liaison person to Board of Education, particularly the Superintendent of Schools. Responsible for planning the first regional conference in the state, bringing together educators from two cities and arranging intervisitations and conferences.

Project Director for a video education program at a city public school utilizing cable TV. In addition is assistant trainer and consultant attached to an educational model program for the public schools of an industrial city in New England.

Faculty member, Adjunct Instructor in the Education Department of an independent liberal arts college. Supervises student teachers working in the elementary grades. Teaches a class in "Language Arts Methods in the Elementary Grades."

Associate Director of a day care center in a metropolitan area which is staffed 60% by community people, including bilingual personnel. (Priority is given to children with "the most needs and fewest options.") Additionally, teaches a course in early childhood education at a city college.

Director of an upper school. Developing head teacher-administrator team. Coordinates core curriculum planning, working with parents who are assisting in the school. Also teaches a course at a graduate college of education.

Open Classroom Coordinator for an entire public school district, and a member of the advisory service of a large city college.

Members of Group 4 (1973):

Faculty member in a graduate college of education--Adviser to Teacher Corps interns assigned to two inner-city schools with predominantly black and Puerto Rican student populations; Adviser to teachers and supervisory personnel in an Open Corridor program in city public school system.

Principal of a large city parochial school in dynamic community of Spanish-speaking and black residents; school serves children from first grade through eighth grade.

Educational consultant in early childhood and instructor for agencies and programs training day care and other preschool teaching personnel.

As student Advisor, faculty member in a graduate college of education --trainer of preservice teachers; instructor and consultant for an educational training corporation developing new skills of inservice teaching personnel.

Assistant Director for training and career development in a large governmental agency; broad responsibilities in training and curriculum development for day care centers throughout metropolitan area.

Associate Director of a large, community-sponsored day care center in an urban neighborhood with bilingual population.